

Meeting:	Joint Committee on Strategic Planning and Transport
Date:	05 March 2020
From:	Joint Officer Steering Group

Greater Nottingham Joint Planning Advisory Board Update

1 Summary

1.1 The Greater Nottingham Joint Planning Advisory Board (JPAB) oversees the preparation of aligned Local Plans across Greater Nottingham, and the implementation of projects funded through the partnership. This report updates the Joint Committee on the work of JPAB, and other strategic planning matters within the remit of the Committee.

2 Background

2.1 The last meeting of JPAB was held on 15 December 2020. The latest available minutes are from the meeting held on 22 September 2020, and these are appended to this report (appendix 1).

2.2 A summary of the main issues discussed at the 22 September meeting is provided below, updated as necessary.

2.3 The JPAB received a presentation from John King of Rushcliffe Borough Council outlining the findings of the Greater Nottingham Green & Blue Infrastructure Study (Phase 1). Work is ongoing to commission part 2 of the study, which will be embedded in the new Greater Nottingham Strategic Plan.

2.4 JPAB also considered a report on progress with Strategic Plan preparation in Greater Nottingham.

2.5 Consultation on the growth Options document closed on 14 September, and around 4000 individual comments have been received. A new project plan and timetable is in preparation, to reflect delays caused by Coronavirus. This will be reported to JPAB in due course.

2.6 It was noted that Erewash BC's consultation on a separate "Options for Growth" document covering their Borough only had also concluded, and the Ashfield DC have commissioned evidence supporting work, and are in the process of reviewing the implications of the current government consultations, in particular the implication of the proposed changes to the standard methodology.

2.7 JPAB resolved to hold two workshops in early 2021 to consider an appropriate strategic planning strategy for Greater Nottingham, taking into account the representations received on the Growth Options Consultation. The first of these was held on 19 January 2021, and matters discussed included the vision and objectives of the plan, the potential scale of growth, key constraints and opportunities and infrastructure provision. It also

considered the consultation options, and a consensus emerged around a strategy based on firstly sustainable urban development, and secondly key opportunity sites at Toton/Chetwynd and Ratcliffe upon Trent.

- 2.8 The second workshop is to be held 24 February 2021, and a verbal update will be given to Joint Committee.
- 2.9 Update reports were also presented, on the Waste and Minerals Local Plans, on Homes England Capacity Funding Projects Monitoring.
- 2.10 The meeting agenda papers are available to view at <http://www.gnplan.org.uk/about-gnpp/joint-planning-advisory-board-meetings/>.

3 Recommendation

- 3.1 It is recommended that the Joint Committee note the contents of this report.

4 Background papers referred to in compiling this report

- 4.1 JPAB Papers, 15 December 2020

Contact Officer

Matt Gregory
Head of Planning Strategy and Building Control
Nottingham City Council

matt.gregory@nottinghamcity.gov.uk

0115 876 3981

APPENDIX 1

ITEM 3 MINUTES OF THE GREATER NOTTINGHAM JOINT PLANNING ADVISORY BOARD (JPAB) MEETING HELD ON TUESDAY 22 SEPTEMBER 2020 VIA MS TEAMS
--

PRESENT

Ashfield: Councillor M Relf

Erewash: Councillor M Powell

Gedling: Councillor J Hollingsworth

Nottingham City: Councillor L Woodings, Councillor M Edwards

Nottinghamshire County: Councillor T Harper (Chair)

Rushcliffe: Councillor R Upton

Officers in Attendance

Broxtowe: Ruth Hyde; Mark Thompson

Derbyshire County: Steve Buffery

Erewash: Steve Birkinshaw

Gedling: Alison Gibson

Growth Point: Matthew Gregory; Peter McAnespie

Nottingham City: Paul Seddon

Nottinghamshire County: Sally Gill

Rushcliffe: David Mitchell

Observers

David Bainbridge

Robert Galij

Andrew Bamber

Dave Lawson
Kelvin Humphreys
N. Corbishley
Paul Stone
Tom Genway
Caolan Gaffney
Angela Smedley
Steve Freek

Apologies

Derbyshire County: Councillor T King

1. Introductions and Apologies

Councillor T Harper (Chair) welcomed everyone to the meeting, which was virtual (and recorded) due to Covid-19 restrictions and apologies were noted.

2. Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest.

3. Approval of Minutes of the Last Meeting and Matters Arising

The Minutes of the previous meeting held on 30 June 2020 were approved as recorded.

4. Government Consultations – (1) Planning for the Future White Paper and (2) Changes to the current planning system (Matt Gregory)

- 4.1 MG reported that the MHCLG published its much anticipated White Paper on 6 August to introduce changes to the planning system. Consultation on the White Paper would close on 31 October. There is also a separate consultation for a revised standard methodology for housing need. The recommendation for JPAB is to consider the Planning for the Future White Paper, with the preparation of a joint response delegated to the ESG for matters of strategic interest, where there is a consensus view.
- 4.2 MG proceeded with a short slide presentation outlining the main proposals. Section 4 of the report which covered consultation on the

proposed standard methodology and its implications for individual councils.

4.3 The key points to note were:

- Government's intention to speed up the planning process.
- Identify land in the Local Plan for the following three development categories:
 - Growth
 - Renewal
 - Protected

- Local Plans would have a simplified examination procedure. Local development management policies to be replaced by nationally set policies. Duty to Co-operate to be removed.
- The Local Plan is currently produced every five years but a new 30 month deadline is proposed to ensure that there is enough land for housing, subject to new statutory requirements. Sustainability Appraisal to be replaced with a simpler and more transparent process to meet the requirements of law.
- S106 to be replaced with a new levy capturing land value uplift which will also apply to developments built under permitted development rights.
- A revised and mandatory standard methodology to ensure that there will be sufficient housing in areas with affordability issues.
- Large sites to be split between several developers offering different housing products. Planning application phases, housing delivery and sales would be faster. Planning applications where required will be streamlined through a greater focus at the plan making stage. There will be penalties imposed where councils fail to determine within guidelines.
- Each Council to appoint a Chief Officer for design and place-making.

4.4 MG asked Members to consider the draft comments at Appendix 1 to respond to the Government's White Paper.

4.5 TH thought the comments were of good quality.

4.6 MP was mindful that there may only a response from JPAB and not from individual councils. He thanked MG for the presentation and asked who might be responding on behalf of JPAB.

4.7 LW noted that the current process is lengthy, but there is less funding being provided by government. The White Paper did not appear to offer a simpler or faster system. She continued to point out that the lack of housing delivery could not be laid at the door of the planning system, as developers have received planning permission but these were not being built out. Within the City Centre further support is required for brownfield sites due to fragile viability, and in certain cases sites have a higher flood risk.

4.8 MG advised that Nottingham City would be providing a separate response in addition to the joint response. Other councils would also respond in their own right. These were confirmed as follows:

NCC will be responding

RBC will be responding to both consultations

GBC will be submitting two separate responses

ADC will respond to both consultations

BBC will provide a separate response to both consultations

MG also noted to agree a joint response.

4.9 MR (ADC) reinforced Cllr Woodings comment about financial pressures. He advised that ADC had amongst the lowest affordability for housing in the UK despite them requiring an increase of 69% in houses they needed to provide in the area. They already have low house prices, and developers will not build even if it is in the Local Plan, they tend to cherry pick sites. There are some good ideas in the White Paper but there was also a lot wrong with it.

4.10 SBk (EBC) supported the changes for Sustainability Appraisals and to move away from the old system. He was positive about the new strategic CIL. He continued to say that the Local Plan was harder to adopt than giving planning permission as it takes five years to adopt a plan but local authorities are expected to grant planning permission within 13 weeks. He considered this change would help to restore a plan-led system. Government reform of the planning system should support regeneration.

4.11 RU (RBC) RBC accepts the need for more housing, and has led the way with its current local plan. We need to enable young people renting who cannot buy affordable housing to get on the housing ladder. With his previous knowledge and experience of the planning system as a Chartered Surveyor he has seen the planning system become more bureaucratic and slow. It takes 5-7 years for a Local Plan to be approved therefore it needs radical reform. Suggest a joint response and own responses as well.

4.12 ME (N.City) found the proposals intriguing in terms of environmental challenges as the City faces a number of consequences of climate change, including flooding and urban over-heating. However, high quality, sustainable and carbon neutral developments are what is needed. The ability to convert premises to flats make no reference to the value of the offices, and do not contribute to affordable housing or local open space. If it is less profitable then developers will just sit on the land. The area needs housing solutions which are fit for the 21st Century.

- 4.13 MG will sum up the wide range of views to agree a joint response and respond to government, including any alternative suggestions that might be preferable.

Joint Planning Advisory Board was resolved to:

- (a) **CONSIDER** the implications of the Government Consultations on the current planning system and on the Planning for the Future White Paper; and
- (b) **DELEGATE** the preparation of a joint response on matters of strategic interest where there is a consensus of view to the Executive Steering Group.

5. **Greater Nottingham Strategic Plan Update** (Matt Gregory)

5.1 MG gave an update on the plan making process which has been delayed due to Covid-19. The Greater Nottingham Strategic Plan consultation has now been completed and responses are currently being assessed. EBC have also completed their consultation and are assessing all representations received. With regards to ADC's Local Plan they are currently assessing their evidence base and the implications of the government's proposed Standard Methodology for their area.

5.2 An open letter was sent by a number of parish councils requesting suspension of the Growth Options consultation for the following reasons:

- (i) Covid-19 impact on consultation process
- (ii) Longer term impact of plans
- (iii) Is the Government's White Paper appropriate for the future?
- (iv) Local communities have not had chance to challenge the evidence base of Local Plans

It was suggested that the Board responds as follows:

- (i) Government expects councils to continue with Local Plan preparation and has issued guidance how to undertake community involvement with current consultations being extended to allow more time to respond.
- (ii) Councils have less control over planning decisions where their Local Plans become out of date.
- (iii) Preparing flexible policies to respond to the issues and challenges arising from Covid 19.
- (iv) The White Paper proposals for changing the planning system are unlikely to be introduced quickly therefore for the interim there is a need to continue with Duty to Co-operate as this is still a legal requirement.
- (v) The ability to challenge key elements of the Growth Options Study was available during the public consultation.

MG asked for views on whether to continue with the plan making process for the Greater Nottingham.

RU (RBC) gave their support to keep the plan moving along.

MP (EBC) expressed his concern that we were running out of time and agreed with RBC. There has been adequate time given for community involvement and EBC completed face to face meetings prior to the Covid restrictions. Developers will force the process so we should not delay.

LW (Nottingham City) agreed that it would be wrong to delay the process. Consultation time periods had been extended and for a vast majority consultation was available online, and people who did not have access to the internet at home were able to have access when some of the libraries reopened. This virus situation could last for another 18+ months. We need to be more imaginative how we consult and suggested using methods such as MS Teams.

MG confirmed the consensus to provide a joint response for the reasons set out in the report for the Chair, Cllr Tony Harper, to send the letter on behalf of JPAB.

5.3 MG referred to the reasons why Duty to Co-operate was still the best option for plan making in Greater Nottingham. It remains law until it is replaced and until then it is important to continue. Working in partnership has attracted additional resources such as HE Funding and has saved individual councils significant money.

5.4 ME (Nottingham City) referred to para 7.6 regarding Gypsies and Travellers and how to address new ways to consult with their community. MG advised that results would be available in November as consultations were now able to take place. The results of the study will inform the Strategic Plan Review.

Joint Planning Advisory Board was resolved to:

- (a) NOTE the delay to progress with Strategic Plan preparation in Greater Nottingham and the situation with the Erewash Growth Options Consultation; and**
- (b) AGREE that a joint response be prepared to the open letter appended to this report, explaining that the partner Councils consider it is important to continue the strategic plan making process for the reasons set out in section 4 of this report.**

6. Waste and Minerals Local Plans Update (Sally Gill/Steve Buffery)

6.1 SG reported that the Nottinghamshire Minerals Local Plan was submitted to the Secretary of State earlier this year and had hoped for Examination at the end of April. However due to lockdown restrictions the date has

had to be postponed until 26 October and will now be a virtual Examination although conducted in the same way as any other Local Plan Examination by the Planning Inspector.

- 6.2 The Waste Local Plan will be a joint plan with Nottinghamshire County and Nottingham City Councils. All comments are currently being looked at following the Issues and Options consultation and these will inform the first draft of the Waste Local Plan.
- 6.3 SBuffery from Derbyshire County Council reported that their Minerals Local Plan was jointly being prepared with Derby City Council. They have also experienced Covid-19 implications on progressing the Plan which has impacted on timescales. The key change is to incorporate a sand and gravel document into the Plan upto 2036. Due to a shortfall in sand and gravel sites being promoted there was a consultation to identify any additional sites suitable for allocation. There are now an additional three sites making a total of eight sites overall which will now be consulted on. There will be an eight weeks consultation from October with a Derbyshire Minerals Local Plan anticipated early next year. The Issues and Options consultation will be published towards the end of the year or early next year.
- 6.4 ME asked if DCC had any information regarding a proposal for another incinerator in Derby, and if lessons could be learned from Nottinghamshire to ensure a more green approach to waste management. SBuffery was unable to comment as the proposal falls within the Derby City Council area.

<p>Joint Planning Advisory Board was resolved to NOTE the progress with the Nottinghamshire/Nottingham and Derbyshire Waste and Minerals Local Plans.</p>
--

7. Homes England Capacity Funding projects monitoring

(Peter McAnespie)

- 7.1 PMcA highlighted two references to note from the report. GBC will need to address how they intend to progress with their remaining funding and EBC will need to provide information on how they intend to progress with the Stanton Regeneration site.
- 7.2 Appendix 1 illustrated how the money has been spent for the period. All other projects (except those mentioned above) are heading towards completion.
- 7.3 MP explained that he was unable to provide an update on the Stanton site due to its current sensitive state with developers and landowners.

Joint Planning Advisory Board resolved to NOTE this report and the details set out in Appendix 1.

8. **Any other business**

Nil

9. **Future Meetings 2020**

DATE	TIME	VENUE
Tuesday 15 December	2.00 pm	Council Chamber, Ground Floor, Council Offices, Beeston (to be agreed)

MEETING CLOSED AT 3.15 PM